

100 Saint Ayers Way  
Chapel Hill, NC 27517-2362  
Dated: June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2009

Commissioner for Patents  
USPTO, PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

(Kind attn: Mr. Vivek D Koppikar, Examiner, ART Unit 3686)

Subject: patent application 10/735,333 filing date 12/12/2003

Reference: your letter dated 12/02/2008

Dear Mr. Koppikar:

It was very nice to talk with you over the phone today, and as advised, I am filing this response to your above letter.

Your kind guidance in improving this patent application is sincerely appreciated.

Your observations have been noted, and necessary modifications made as following:

1. Claims have been revised to specifically address your observations, and follow one sentence limit, focused on describing the system or method, as applicable, in accordance with enablement requirement,
2. The scope of being indefinite in claims interpretation has been addressed, as advised in your letter.

No changes are made to the description section, invention summary, abstract, or any other sections not included in 1 through 2 above.

With regard to your observations about claim rejection in view of the previously granted patent reference cited by you, Tam (6,968,457), I am excerpting and augmenting some of the previous arguments presented in the response filed on October 09, 2008:

- This invention is different in the sense that this application specifies a schema to issue a unique identification for every human being on the planet, and that there is no similarity between this application and Tam (6,968,457). Tam specifically introduces the transmission of a pre-defined

finger print sequence to be transmitted in a specific order to verify personal identity biometric data, and it is in no way connected to issuing a unique identification number to every single individual on the planet.

- Tam (6,968,457) does not specify any unique procedure for allocation of the PIN.
- The current invention (10/735,333) gives the schema stated in attachments 1 and 2 of the application that specifically cites an algorithm to generate a unique UIN.
- The intent and scope of the two applications Tam (6,968,457) and current invention (10/735,333) is radically different. For example, The PINs currently issued by banks to use the ATM (Automated Teller Machines) by credit cards can be further verified by the procedure set forth by Tam (6,968,457), if appropriate finger print scanners/readers were attached to ATM machines, but Tam (6,968,457) fails to define the specifics of the system and method to issue a PIN. To that extend, any generic PIN issuing schematic can be conflicting with the claims made by Tam (6,968,457).
- In the present application, the focus of invention is to define an algorithm that generates a very specific and unique alpha-numeric number that can uniquely identify a person on the planet, irrespective of nationality, geographic location, or any other considerations.
- The focus of Tam (6,968,457) is to get a PIN associated with a file of biometric and other personal identification data collected from the user. This PIN is just to make sure that the right folks can get to the right data, just like the PIN associated with an ATM access, where PIN acts like a secured access code. To that extend, it is even likely that there can potentially be identical PINs if the user is allowed to pick a PIN by choice (for instance any 4 digit combination). In contrast, UIN is unique, and the objective of UIN in current application is to serve as a unique Global Cross- Reference Identifier, and a UIN is issued only once to each UIN holder/applicant. Also, UIN is meant to uniquely identify any specific individual across the planet, irrespective of nationality or origin.
- In essence, Tam (6,968,457) suggests a method to secure the biometric and other confidential data by use of a PIN. Tam (6,968,457) does not propose a unique identification number for every specific individual human being on the planet.
- The invention in current application is not obvious by modifying the teachings of Tam (6,968,457) as both the intent and content of Tam and

current application are very different. While the focus of this application is to define a system and method to issue an identification number to uniquely identify each human being on the planet that can be utilized in different applications, Tam focuses on securely accessing biometric data by using human fingerprints in a particular pre-defined and memorized sequence and raising a distress signal by use of a specific fingerprint sequence if it is apprehended that the data could be compromised.

Additionally, I would like to mention that as I have informed you during our conversation, I have since filed a CIP (Continuation-In-Part) to this 10/735,333 application. The CIP application details are as follows:

EFS Id: 4880381

Application Number: 12395669

Confirmation Number: 4820


Filing date: March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009-06-02

Previous claims 16 to 30 in respect of application 10/735,333 filing date

12/12/2003 are cancelled and new claims 1 to 11 are attached.

I hope that the above clarifications and changes made to the claims address all your observations. Kindly let me know if there remains anything that still needs to be addressed, or if you have any further observations.

Respectfully submitted,



/ABHINAV AGGARWAL/

Abhinav Aggarwal, Ph.D.

USPTO Customer No. 59597

Enclosure:

1. Revised Claims
2. SB 21 form
3. SB 22 form
4. Payment of \$555 small entity fee for extension of reply